Society of Natural History, collected in Boston, at least one (and probably both), cannot have been gathered later than 1868.

Ricinus communis, L. I have with some hesitation included in my list. It has been collected in two successive years, however, at Dedham, Massachusetts, by Mr. E. F. Williams.

A plant labelled "Shepherdia argentea, Roxbury, Massachusetts, 1849, [J. A.] Lowell," in the Boston Society of Natural History herbarium cannot represent a native of our range.

Shepherdia canadensis, Nutt. may perhaps be sought in Coös County, New Hampshire, since it is found in Madison, Maine, and in Vermont. The Vermont stations, however, are in the western part of the State.

ANDOVER, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Occurrence of Verbena stricta and Helianthus mol-LIS IN Massachusetts.— On Aug. 2d, 1903, Dr. B. J. Handy and the writer were botanizing in some fields on the outskirts of Fall River. At the edge of an excavation in a bank of glacial till a plant was seen which had the characteristic appearance of Verbena, but the larger blue flowers and the coarseness of the plant showed at a glance that it was not Verbena hastata, L. common in this region. Upon analysis it proved to be Verbena stricta, Vent. About a dozen plants were observed growing among the stones and coarse soil in the pit.

As we continued our walk in an adjoining field another group of unfamiliar plants, in full flower, attracted our attention. This colony was more extensive, there being some fifty plants, which proved to be *Helianthus mollis*, Lam. As no station in New England is mentioned in any of the standard manuals of botany, both plants being native of the West and South, inquiry was made at the Gray Herbarium, and a search of the available literature brought to light but two New England records of *Verbena stricta*, namely from Bridgeport and Manchester, Connecticut (recorded in Bishop's Catalogue of Connecticut Plants), while *Helianthus mollis* does not appear to be recorded in New England at all.

The fields in which these plants were found are very close to a large cotton mill, and it is probable that the seeds of both species were brought North in the raw cotton and thrown into the fields with

the waste material from the mill. In the case of *Helianthus mollis*, it is probable, judging from the less bunched position of the plants, that the cotton waste containing the seeds was spread on the field as a fertilizer, a not uncommon practice. — S. N. F. Sanford, Fall River, Massachusetts.

NOTE ON THE POLYGAMY OF CHIONANTHUS.— In the article of Mr. Rehder in Rhodora (6: 18, 1904), concerning the polygamy of the flowers of Chionanthus Virginica, there is reference to a statement of Thomas Meehan that it is mentioned in the later edition of Gray's Manual, which Mr. Rehder has failed to verify, Mr. Meehan evidently referred to what is found in a brief characterization of Chionanthus among the tribal divisions of Oleaceae in the sixth edition, p. 335. It is said of the genus: "Flowers complete, sometimes polygamous." Such a character might be construed as a general one and be referred to the genus as including C. retusa. But it is not the custom of the book, designed to help students of the flora to a safe knowledge of what they may expect to find in the area it covers, to put in needless statements. Then this habit of the plants had not been given in former editions where the tribal divisions are also characterized, and the inference from this would be that the polygamy was that of C. virginica, the only one of the genus described. The statement not being placed in the full description of the genus or species is easily overlooked. - E. J. HILL, Chicago, Illinois.

Two noteworthy Plants of New Haven, Connecticut.— Phaseolus perennis, Walt. was collected by the writer, in flower, on August 18th, 1903, and later in good fruit, in the woods skirting the base of East Rock, New Haven. It makes a vigorous growth here, and the vines cover the low ledges over which they climb. The station is only a few rods from the edge of a salt marsh, and at a slight elevation above it. In Rhodora II: 92, April, 1900, Hon. J. R. Churchill discusses the occurrence of Phaseolus perennis in New England, and states that the record for New England rested at that time solely on three specimens all collected more than forty years before at New Haven, Conn. He could find no other New England specimens of the species in our principal herbaria, nor any botanist